

Appl. No.: 10/667,047

Non-final Office Action Mailing Date: May 18, 2007

Amendment Mailing Date: August 20, 2007

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The Office Action of May 18, 2007, has been carefully reviewed and this response addresses the Examiner's concerns stated in the Office Action. All rejections are respectfully traversed. This Office Action response is due to be filed on August 18, 2007, which falls on a Saturday. Therefore, this Office Action response is timely filed on or before August 20, 2007.

### **I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS**

Claims 1-30 are pending in the application.

Claim 14 has been amended to correct typographical omissions. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin et al., U.S. Patent Number 6,314,426, filed on April 5, 1999 (Martin), in view of Ausems, U.S. Patent Application Number 2003/0013483, filed on July 6, 2001, published on January 16, 2003 (Ausems). Applicants respectfully note that Ausems was published within a year of the filing date of the present application (September 22, 2003). Applicants reserve the right to file an affidavit under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 to swear behind Ausems.

### **II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

On pages 3-9, in paragraph 4, the Office Action states that claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin in view of Ausems.

It is submitted, with respect to claims 1 and 9, that neither Martin nor Ausems, nor their combination, discloses Applicants' claimed retrieving from the server information related to a selected object that is selected from an Object Browser because (1) neither Martin nor Ausems discloses or suggests an Object Browser, (2) neither Martin nor Ausems discloses or suggests retrieving, from the

server by a handheld device, information related to an object selected from the Object Browser on the handheld device. With respect to (1), in the system of Martin, files are statically related to each other, and groups of files are moved from a server to a cable subscriber when the user makes a selection. Martin does not disclose or suggest an Object Browser as defined by the specification:

An Object Browser divides a screen display into two types of screen areas or panes: a navigation pane displaying one or more visual objects, said pane enabling a user to select the object the user wants more information about, and an information pane that displays detailed information about an object. An Object Browser enables a user to easily access information about specific objects and compare and contrast information about inter-set sets of objects. (Applicants' Specification, paragraph 12)

Further, referring to <http://ui.netbeans.org/docs/ui/objectBrowser/ObjectBrowserUV.html>, an Object Browser, for example, in NetBeans, is a facility by which a user can view an object hierarchy. Referring to [http://msdn2.microsoft.com/en-US/library/aa291906\(VS.71\).aspx](http://msdn2.microsoft.com/en-US/library/aa291906(VS.71).aspx), an Object Browser, for example, in MICROSOFT®'s Visual Studio, is composed of three panes: the Objects pane, the Members pane, and the Description pane. By default, the Objects pane displays in the left side of the Object Browser, the Members pane displays on the right side, and the Description pane displays at the bottom. Clearly, an Object Browser is a structure that displays objects in panes, not a generic browser which is commonly known to be a software application used to locate and display Web pages.

Ausems cannot make up the deficiency in Martin because, in Ausems, the screen is divided into a system status area and a browser area, where Ausems's browser executes to display an HTML page having current or recent application information for respective user applications, which user applications may be accessed through interaction with the browser (Ausems, claim 1). Nowhere, however, does Ausems disclose or suggest Applicants' claimed an Object Browser.

Further with respect to independent claims 1 and 9, and dependent claims 7, 8, and 20, neither Martin nor Ausems discloses or suggests Applicants' claimed navigation and information panes. Both Martin and Ausems provide information in *windows* and *pages*, not panes, which are divisions of windows. With respect to claims 7, 8, and 20, Martin specifically states that windows can be resized, but nowhere mentions the same capability for panes. Ausems cannot make up the deficiency of Martin because Ausems discloses neither panes nor resizing at all. Martin and Ausems do not disclose or suggest interrelated navigation and information panes in which the information pane displays

detailed information about the object selected in the navigation pane. Martin does not disclose a handheld device that has a screen that can be divided into panes. In Ausems, items that are selected on the handheld device activate pre-established programs, for example, e-mail, address book, etc., but nowhere does Ausems disclose selecting an object in one pane and displaying of detailed information about the selected object in another pane of the handheld device.

It is submitted that dependent claim 2 is patentable at least because of its dependence upon independent claim 1.

With respect to dependent claim 3, it is submitted that neither Martin nor Ausems discloses or suggests Applicants' claimed communications link between the portable handheld device and the server comprises a mechanism for synchronization with the server because (1) Martin does not disclose any synchronization whatsoever, and (2) Ausems cannot make up the deficiency of Martin because Ausems's synchronization is with a personal computer, not a server. With respect to (2), Ausems draws a distinction between communication with a server and synchronization with a PC (Ausems, paragraph 56), and thus teaches away from Applicants' claimed synchronization with a server. In Ausems, synchronization does not happen between a server and the handheld device, but rather between a PC and the handheld device.

It is submitted that dependent claims 4-6 and 10 are patentable at least because of their selective dependence upon independent claims 1 and 9.

With respect to dependent claim 11, it is submitted that neither Martin nor Ausems discloses or suggests Applicants' claimed information concerning objects represented in the navigation pane is downloaded from the remote server and stored in the storage system of the handheld communications system because neither Martin nor Ausems discloses or suggests either (1) objects or (2) downloading from the remote server to a storage system of the handheld communications device. In Martin, there is no storage on the handheld system, which is, for example, a mouse or a joystick that is controlled by a cable subscriber. In Ausems, pages are downloaded, but there is no step of saving what is downloaded to the storage system handheld device.

It is submitted that dependent claims 12-13 are patentable at least because of their dependence upon independent claim 9.

With respect to dependent claims 14 and 19, it is submitted that neither Martin nor Ausems makes obvious Applicants' claimed step of displaying a new Object Browser wherein the new Object Browser includes a navigation pane that displays symbols representing the selected object and other objects and an information pane that displays detailed information about the selected object because (1) Martin and Ausems do not disclose or suggest an Object Browser as discussed previously, and (2) Martin and Ausems do not disclose or suggest interrelated navigation and information panes in which the information pane displays detailed information about the object selected in the navigation pane. Martin does not disclose a handheld device that has a screen that can be divided into panes. In Ausems, items that are selected on the handheld device activate pre-established programs, for example, e-mail, address book, etc., but nowhere does Ausems disclose selecting an object in one pane and displaying of detailed information about the selected object in another pane of the handheld device.

With further respect to dependent claim 14, it is submitted that neither Martin nor Ausems discloses or suggests Applicants' claimed steps of selecting an object displayed in the information pane and displaying a new Object Browser wherein the new Object Browser includes a new navigation pane that displays symbols representing the selected object and other objects and a new information pane that displays detailed information about the selected object because neither Martin nor Ausems discloses or suggests an information pane, a new navigation pane, nor a new information pane. Neither Martin nor Ausems discloses or suggests that a new navigation pane and a new information pane can result from the selection of an object in an information pane, i.e. a drilling down process.

It is submitted that dependent claims 15-18 and 21-30 are patentable at least because of their dependence upon independent claim 9.

Since Martin and Ausems, either individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element of Applicants' claims 1-30, Applicants' claims 1-30 are not made obvious by Martin and Ausems, and a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is inappropriate. Applicants assert that claims 1-30, are now in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the

Appl. No.: 10/667,047

Non-final Office Action Mailing Date: May 18, 2007

Amendment Mailing Date: August 20, 2007

rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) with regards to Applicants' claims 1-30, for the reasons set forth above.

### III. CONCLUSION

Independent claims 1 and 9 are believed to be in condition for allowance for the reasons stated above. All dependent claims depend upon independent claims that are believed to be allowable, and are therefore also believed to be in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully urge the Examiner to find all claims presented in the present application in condition for allowance and pass the case to issue.

The Commissioner for Patents is authorized to charge the any fees, including the fees for three terminal disclaimers, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 03-2410, Order No. 26000.0.1.

The following information is presented in the event that a call may be deemed desirable by the Examiner:

KATHLEEN CHAPMAN (617) 345-3210

Respectfully submitted,

Karen Holtzblatt et al., Applicants

Date: August 20, 2007

By:

*Kathleen Chapman, D.J. Jones*

Kathleen Chapman

Reg. No. 46,094

Attorney for Applicants

01165162